

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), and for confirming that the certified copy of the priority document has been received at the Patent Office.

Claim Amendments:

Applicant notes that, as shown in the previous section, Applicant has amended claims 1, 6 and 11 to essentially incorporate the limitations of claims 3, 8 and 13, respectively. Thus, claims 3, 8 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1-15 are all of the claims pending in the present application, and currently all of the claims stand rejected.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection - Claims 1-15:

Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,643,029 to Kumada. In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

Kumada discloses an apparatus for generating a Look-Up-Table concerning conversion and correction of color space conversion (RGB to PCS to YMCK). Thus, the image processing in Kumada is only directed to the conversion and correction of the color space. Therefore, Applicant submits that Kumada has little or no relevance to the image processing method of the claimed invention. Specifically, Kumada fails to disclose a processing method where the image data processing contents are "image correction processing contents for making a correction to an

image and image scaling processing contents for enlarging and reducing an image.” *See* claim 1, *see also* claims 6 and 11 (emphasis added). In Kumada, there is no disclosure of at least this aspect of the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that Kumada fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that Kumada fails to anticipate the claimed invention set forth in at least claims 1, 6 and 11, as required under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant hereby requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection - Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15:

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,281,992 to Kondo. In view of the following discussion, Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejection.

Kondo discloses a system and method for producing and reproducing electronic images. Specifically, a number of data input devices 12 are coupled to an image processing unit 14 which processes the data from each of the input devices 12 and outputs the data to a number of output devices 16, which can be printers, etc. The processing unit contains a number of profiles 18 which are set to correspond to the various input devices 12. Further, the processing unit also contains a number of profiles 20 which correspond to the output devices 16. *See* col. 4, lines 23-42.

An image processing space 22 is used to select the appropriate profiles 18 and 20, which correspond to the input 12 and output 16 devices, which are being used to process an image data.

The image data is processed in the processing space 22 using the profiles 18 and 20, such that an image can be produced which corresponds to the original image, regardless of the input 12 and output 16 devices that are being used.

However, in Kondo, image processing is performed in response to an input/output device and includes only a two-dimensional space filter for stabilize MTF characteristics between the devices. Applicant submits that this is different from the claimed invention in which appropriate resolution conversion algorithm, contrast, chroma and the like are selected and processed in response to the characteristic of each input device to obtain an optimum output result.

Additionally, one of the purposes of processing in Kondo is to stabilize the MTF characteristics of an image input from or output to the input/output device, instead of to obtain an optimum output result. In other words, the purpose of the Kondo is to obtain same output result regardless of using any input/output device. On the other, hand, the present invention permits the output of a different result, and aims to obtain the optimum output result, that is, to obtain the most desirable output.

To obtain this result, the present invention is a processing method where the image data processing contents are “image correction processing contents for making a correction to an image and image scaling processing contents for enlarging and reducing an image.” *See* claim 1, *see also* claims 6 and 11 (emphasis added). In Kondo, there is no disclosure of at least this aspect of the claimed invention. Namely, there is no disclosure of having the image data processing contents be image correction processing contents for making a correction to the

image and image scaling processing contents for enlarging and reducing the image. For at least this reason, Kondo fails to disclose each and every aspect of the claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that Kondo fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that Kondo fails to anticipate the claimed invention set forth in at least claims 1, 6 and 11, as required under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, Applicant hereby requests the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 14 and 15.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection - Claims 2, 7 and 12:

Claims 2, 7 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,800 to Mizuno et al. However, because Mizuno fails to cure the deficient teachings of Kondo, Applicant submits that these claims are also patentable, at least by reason of their dependence.

Conclusion:

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Application Number 09/449,772

Our Ref: Q57011
Art Unit: 2626

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Terrance J. Wikberg
Registration No. 47,177

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 21, 2004